

Table 2.1.24 Proposed RMP and Alternatives – Visual Resource Management

Table 2.1.24 Proposed RMP and Alternatives – Visual Resource Management					
PROPOSED RMP	Alternative A (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D Current Management (No Action)	Alternative E
VISUAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT — MAP FIGURES 39–44					
GOALS AND OBJECTIVES					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage the public lands in such a way as to preserve those scenic vistas, which are deemed to be most important: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ In their impact on the quality of life for residents and communities in the areas. ◦ In their contribution to the quality of recreational visitor experiences. ◦ In supporting the regional tourism industry and segments of the local economy dependent on public land resources. • Seek to complement the rural, agricultural, historic, and urban landscapes on adjoining private, state, and tribal lands by maintaining the integrity of background vistas on the public lands. 					
MANAGEMENT COMMON TO THE PROPOSED RMP AND ALL ALTERNATIVES					
Maintain or improve the scenic quality of the landscape and design and mitigate visual intrusions consistent with the objectives established for the specific visual resource management classes outlined in the BLM Handbook H-8410-1.					
Approximately 57,776 acres would be managed as VRM Class I. All WSAs and ISA Note: Acreage differences between the alternatives are the result of management prescriptions within the alternatives.	63,136 acres would be managed as VRM Class I. Note: The VRM acreage numbers under Alternative A have been changed to reflect BLM-administered lands only. In the Draft RMP/EIS, lands controlled by other surface management entities were included in the numbers for Alternative A. This change does not impact the analysis of the document.	53,058 acres would be managed as VRM Class I.	145,781 acres would be managed as VRM Class I.	53,086 acres would be managed as VRM Class I.	334,516 acres would be managed as VRM Class I.
Approximately 231,911 acres would be managed as VRM Class II. Note: Acreage differences between the alternatives are the result of management prescriptions within the alternatives.	294,773 acres would be managed as VRM Class II. Note: The VRM acreage numbers under Alternative A have been changed to reflect BLM-administered lands only. In the Draft RMP/EIS, lands controlled by other surface management entities were included in the numbers for Alternative A. This change does not impact the analysis of the document.	114,030 acres would be managed as VRM Class II.	362,660 acres would be managed as VRM Class II.	113,686 acres would be managed as VRM Class II.	259,694 acres would be managed as VRM Class II.
Approximately 786,612 acres would be managed as VRM Class III. Note: Acreage differences between the alternatives are the result of management prescriptions within the alternatives.	716,186 acres would be managed as VRM Class III. Note: The VRM acreage numbers under Alternative A have been changed to reflect BLM-administered lands only. In the Draft RMP/EIS, lands controlled by other surface management entities were included in the numbers for Alternative A. This change does not impact the analysis of the document.	199,179 acres would be managed as VRM Class III.	580,846 acres would be managed as VRM Class III.	199,192 acres would be managed as VRM Class III.	535,586 acres would be managed as VRM Class III.
Approximately 643,641 acres would be managed as VRM Class IV. Note: Acreage differences between the alternatives are the result of management prescriptions within the alternatives.	645,845 acres would be managed as VRM Class IV. Note: The VRM acreage numbers under Alternative A have been changed to reflect BLM-administered lands only. In the Draft RMP/EIS, lands controlled by other surface management entities were included in the numbers for Alternative A. This change does not impact the	1,353,967 acres would be managed as VRM Class IV.	630,653 acres would be managed as VRM Class IV.	1,353,976 acres would be managed as VRM Class IV.	590,140 acres would be managed as VRM Class IV.

Table 2.1.24 Proposed RMP and Alternatives – Visual Resource Management

Table 2.1.24 Proposed RMP and Alternatives – Visual Resource Management					
PROPOSED RMP	Alternative A (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D Current Management (No Action)	Alternative E
<i>VISUAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT — MAP FIGURES 39–44</i>					
	analysis of the document.				